



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,192	09/29/2005	Eiichi Kitazono	Q90681	3913
23373 7590 08/24/2009 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
PALENIK, JEFFREY T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1615				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/551,192

Applicant(s)

KITAZONO ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey T. Palenik

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 and 12-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :29 Sept 2005; 28 Dec. 2005; 8 Feb 2007; 10 June 2008; 17 Aug 2009.

DETAILED ACTION

STATUS OF THE APPLICATION

Applicants' response, filed 19 June 2009 regarding Application N° 11/734,028, is acknowledged and entered on the record. The Examiner acknowledges the following:

Applicants have elected Group II (claims 7-11) **without traverse**, for prosecution on the merits.

Applicants' elections are made **FINAL**. The remaining claims 1-6 and 12-14 (Groups I and III, respectively) are all withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected inventions and/or species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicants timely traversed the lack of unity requirement between the compositions.

Thus, claims 7-11 now represent all claims currently under consideration.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Five Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed 29 September 2005, 28 December 2005, 8 February 2007, 10 June 2008 and 17 August 2009 are all acknowledged and have each been reviewed.

DOUBLE PATENTING

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s)

because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 7-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 of copending Application No. 11/791,115 (US Pre-Grant Publication N° 2007/0298072). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from those which are instantly recited because both the instant and copending compositions are obvious variants if not anticipatory of one another. The instant claim 7 recites a bellows-shaped cylindrical body comprising a membrane which is comprised of fiber structures. The membrane is recited as ranging from 0.05-0.2 mm in thickness (e.g. 50-200 microns). The cylindrical body is recited as having a diameter ranging from 0.5-50 mm (e.g. 50-50,000 microns). The bellows shape is recited as having a crest-to-crest distance of no more than 2.0 mm and a crest-to-valley depth ranging from 0.1-10 mm. Claim 11 recites that the mean fiber size (e.g. thickness) ranges from 0.05-50 microns. The same limitations are recited by claims 1 and 8 of the copending '115 application. The instant claims 8-10 recite compositional limitations to the fiber structure of claim 7 such that the fibers are made from biodegradable, aliphatic polyester polymers selected from polylactic acid,

polyglycolic acid, polycaprolactone or a combination thereof. The same limitations are recited in claims 5 and 6 of the copending '115 application. Given that the compositions of both the copending and instantly claimed applications very closely parallel one another, it follows that one of ordinary skill in the art would have immediately recognized the obvious overlap in subject matter and would have been motivated with a high expectation of success, to prepare the instantly claimed composition.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the

various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(c), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the teachings of Schmitt et al. (USPN 3,463,158).

The instant claims are drawn to a cylindrical, bellows-shaped body comprising a fiber structure, as discussed above. Dimensions of the various aspects of the composition are also discussed above. Claims 8-10 further limit the material of the fiber to PLA, PGA, polycaprolactone and copolymers thereof (e.g. PLGA).

The invention of Schmitt is directed to polyglycolic acid prosthetic devices (Title). The dimensional limitations of claim 11 are expressly taught in Example 3 (col. 6, lines 47-52), whereby PGA is spun into fibers having a diameter of 0.002 inches or approximately 50 microns (see http://www.onlineconversion.com/length_all.htm). Thus, given that the upper limit of fiber thickness is expressly taught, the lower limit of the instantly claimed membrane thickness (e.g. 50 microns) is necessarily taught as well. This limitation is further considered by the Examiner as having been met particularly since Schmitt expressly teaches that the fibers which are prepared may be used to form tubes and thin solid sheets (col. 3, lines 4-5 and lines 59-65). The diameter dimension is expressly taught wherein the sheets and/or tube structures which are formed are further taught as

having "at least one dimension greater than 2 millimeters, and which may have a dimension as great as about 200 millimeters" (col. 3, lines 8-10). Figures 10-14 depict a tube-shaped structure comprising ridges or ribs consistently throughout the entire composition. Example 6 is specifically directed to an arterial prosthesis prepared from a mixture of polyester and polyglycolic acid fibers wherein the resulting prostheses has an overall structural diameter of only 3/16 inches or approximately 4,760 microns (col. 10, lines 22-23). Thus, the Figures and Example expressly teach the bellows-shaped and diameter limitations of the instant claim 7. Figures 5-7 and 9 expressly teach the limitations of claims 8-10, such that the fiber structures are shown from different perspectives as being comprised of different percentages of polyglycolic acid.

The reference, despite teaching the instantly claimed bellows-shaped design in the Figures showing the arterial prostheses, does not expressly teach the instantly claimed peak-to-peak or peak-to-valley dimensions.

However, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have optimized such dimensions, particularly in view of teachings such as Figures 1-7, 9 and 15. Since the values and formats of each parameter with respect to the claimed composition (e.g. fiber thickness) are adjustable, it follows that each is a result-effective parameter that a person having ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. Optimization of parameters is a routine practice that would be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ. In the instant case, Schmitt expressly teaches in Example 3 that the fibers are spun to a preferred thickness of approximately 50 microns. However, per MPEP §2123 (II), preferred teachings provided

in the art do not necessarily constitute a teaching away from the instant claims. As such, it would have been customary for an artisan of ordinary skill, to adjust the filament thickness of the constituent fibers in order to achieve the desired amplitude and frequency dimensions as instantly recited. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, optimization of any of these parameters would have been obvious at the time of Applicants' invention.

Furthermore, based on the express teachings of the reference, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would not only have been highly motivated to produce the instantly claimed composition, but would also have had a reasonably high expectation of successfully doing so. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, alone or in combination, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

All claims have been rejected; no claims are allowed.

CORRESPONDENCE

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey T. Palenik whose telephone number is (571) 270-1966. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am - 5:00 pm; M-F (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey T. Palenik/
Examiner, Art Unit 1615

/MP WOODWARD/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615